

COMMONWEALTH BUREAU OF AGRICULTURE
PARASITOLOGY (HELMINTHOLOGY)
WINCHES FARM.
285, HATFIELD ROAD,
ST. ALBANS, HERTS.

VOLUME 10. Part 14
Pp. 427—458

24th July, 1953

27.8.53.

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of
THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by
FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :
Copenhagen Discussions : Cases 53—63

LONDON:
Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1953

Price Twelve shillings and Sixpence
(All rights reserved)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President : Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)

Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)

Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (*President*) (28th March 1944)

Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)

Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)

Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)

Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)

Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)

Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)

Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)

Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)

Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)

Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)

Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)

Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (5th July 1950)

Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Chairman : The Right Hon. Walter Elliot, C.H., M.C., F.R.S., M.P.

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1

Offices of the Trust : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 10, Part 14 (pp. 427-458)

24th July, 1953

CASE No. 53

ARTICLES 34 AND 35 : PROPOSAL THAT DIFFERENCES IN SPELLING ARISING SOLELY FROM DIFFERENCES IN THE MANNER IN WHICH THE WORD FORMING THE NAME HAS BEEN TRANSLITERATED INTO THE LATIN ALPHABET FROM SOME OTHER ALPHABET SHOULD BE IGNORED FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE LAW OF HOMONYMY

DOCUMENT 53/1

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)530)

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

Dr. HELEN MUIR-WOOD'S PROPOSAL IN REGARD TO THE TREATMENT TO BE ACCORDED UNDER THE LAW OF HOMONYMY TO NAMES DIFFERING FROM ONE ANOTHER IN SPELLING ONLY BY REASON OF THE ADOPTION OF DIFFERENT METHODS FOR TRANSLITERATING A WORD FROM THE CYRILIC, OR SOME OTHER, ALPHABET INTO THE LATIN ALPHABET

In 1951 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 90-92) Dr. Helen Muir-Wood (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature a request for a ruling on the question whether two names, each based upon the same modern patronymic but differing from one another in spelling by reason of the adoption of different methods for transliterating into the Latin alphabet from the Cyrillic or some other alphabet the word of which the names were based should, under Articles 34 (generic names and 35 (trivial names) be regarded as homonyms of one another. The example cited by Dr. Muir-Wood in her application was the case of the names *Jakowleffia* and *Yakowlevia*.

2. Dr. Muir-Wood was of the opinion that names of the foregoing class ought to be regarded as homonyms of one another and recommended the adoption of the following rule in respect both of Article 34 and of Article 35 :—

Where each member of any given pair of generic names or, if in any given genus, of any pair of trivial names, whether specific or subspecific trivial names, or, on the other hand, infra-subspecific trivial names (1) is based upon the same surname and that surname is normally written in some alphabet other than the Latin alphabet, and (2) has the same termination and/or suffix, but the two names differ from one another in spelling only by reason of differences adopted in the transliteration of the surname comprised in the generic names (or trivial names) in question, the two generic names concerned (or, as the case may be, the two trivial names) are to be treated as homonyms of one another.

3. The only comments received in regard to this application came from Dr. K. H. L. Key (*Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Canberra, Australia*) (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 250-251) and Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) (1952, *ibid.*, 6 : 251), and Dr. Henning Lemche (*Copenhagen*) (Document 53/2 annexed hereto). Of these, Mr. Baily supported Dr. Muir-Wood's proposal, while Dr. Key and Dr. Lemche are opposed to the recognition of diacritic marks at all.

4. I am myself in full agreement with Dr. Muir-Wood's proposal, but consider that it should be widened in scope, for the underlying problem is a general one which is liable to arise not only in relation to names based upon patronymics but also in relation to names based upon geographical terms and indeed in relation to any name based upon a word normally written in some alphabet other than the Latin alphabet. I accordingly suggest that the proposal submitted by Dr. Muir-Wood should be broadened on the following lines :—

- (1) Where each generic name of a pair of such names is based upon a word normally written in some alphabet other than the Latin alphabet and the names bear the same termination and/or suffix and are thus identical except for differences arising from the adoption of different methods for transliterating into the Latin alphabet the word upon which the generic names are based, those generic names are to be treated as being homonyms of one another.
- (2) The foregoing rule applies also within any given genus to any pair of names consisting of the trivial names of species or of genus subspecies of species referred to that genus.

5. The immediately following case (Case No. 54) is concerned with the parallel case presented by names based upon barbarous words (*i.e.*, upon words belonging to languages which do not possess an alphabet) and a suggestion is there made (in Document 54/1, paragraph 4) that a combined rule should be adopted for dealing both with that case and with that considered in the present note.

DOCUMENT 53/2

By **HENNING LEMCHE** (*Universitetets Zoologik Museum, Copenhagen*)

Letter dated 6th September, 1953

To the exposition presented by Dr. Helen Muir-Wood on the problems concerning transcription of names, I should like to make some remarks.

Names of genera may be constructed in several ways, one of which is the purely artificial one of putting together some letters to form an artificial word (Article 8, Recommendation (k)). This procedure, I think, makes it possible to get around any difficulty arising out of differing transcriptions of words or names from other alphabets. The essential thing is that the names shall not be so close to each other in appearance as to cause confusion. Therefore, *Mulleria* and *Muelleria* may perhaps be too close to each other—especially if they are given to animals in the same systematic group, but *Jaklowleffia* and *Yakovlevia* are so extremely different that I do not think that any real confusion can arise. We only have to state once and for ever that it is the *spelling*, not the meaning that decides. We cannot make too many philological speculations—earlier experience shows that these will mostly lead us astray.

I do not mean that we are to cancel any schedule as to how to transcribe correctly, but I think that we should not for philological reasons introduce new sources for emendations in cases where such recommendations have not been obeyed.

CASE No. 54

ARTICLES 34 AND 35 : PROPOSAL THAT DIFFERENCES IN THE SPELLING OF NAMES BASED UPON BARBAROUS WORDS ARISING SOLELY FROM THE ADOPTION OF DIFFERENT METHODS FOR TRANSCRIBING INTO THE LATIN ALPHABET THE BARBAROUS WORD CONCERNED SHOULD BE DISREGARDED FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE LAW OF HOMONYMY

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)739)

DOCUMENT 54/1

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

In the immediately preceding case (Case No. 53) we were concerned with the question whether any two otherwise identical names based upon a word normally written in some alphabet other than the Latin alphabet but differing from one another in spelling by reason of the adoption of different methods for transliterating the word concerned should be treated as homonyms of one another. A similar problem arises in connection with names based upon barbarous words (*i.e.*, upon words used in languages not possessing an alphabet).

2. Names of the class under consideration are for the most part based upon the names of places or other geographical terms, but there are, no doubt, also similar cases of names based upon patronymics (*e.g.*, names of chieftains, hunters, collectors and the like belonging to peoples who have no alphabet. Two examples of names which presumably belong, at least by origin, to the first of these groups are provided in the application relating to the trivial names of certain woodpeckers submitted by the Marquess Hachisuka (*Atami, Shizuoka Ken, Japan*) (see 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 9 : 102-103). The names in question are *saghalinensis* and *sakhalinensis* and *tianschanicus* and *tianshanicus*. Cases of trivial names of this sort could be multiplied almost indefinitely ; I cannot at the moment recall an instance where this problem has arisen in connection with generic names but I do not doubt that cases of this kind have occurred in this field.

3. It would clearly be most confusing—as well as entirely illogical—to accept as available names in the same genus, pairs of names of the kind cited by the Marquess Hachisuka. It is accordingly suggested that the following rules should be adopted :—

- (1) Where each generic name of any pair of such names is based upon a barbarous word (*i.e.*, upon a word belonging to a language not possessing an alphabet) and the names are identical except for differences in spelling arising from the adoption of different methods for transcribing the barbarous word concerned into the Latin alphabet, the generic names in question are to be treated as being homonyms of one another.
- (2) The foregoing rule applies also within any given genus to any given pair of names consisting of the trivial names of species or of subspecies of species referred to that genus.

4. It might be considered convenient to group into a single rule to be added to Articles 34 and 35 both the rule suggested above and the rule suggested in Document 53/1 in Case No. 53 in relation to names based upon words normally written in some alphabet other than the Latin alphabet. In anticipation of such a view being adopted, the following draft of a combined rule is submitted for consideration :—

- (1) Each generic name comprised in any pair of such names is to be treated as a homonym of the other :—
 - (a) where the generic names in question (i) are based upon a word normally written in an alphabet other than the Latin alphabet and (ii) bear the same termination and/or suffix, and (iii) are thus identical except for differences in spelling arising from the adoption of different methods for transliterating into the Latin alphabet the word upon which the name is based ;
 - (b) where the generic names in question (i) are based upon a barbarous word (*i.e.*, upon a word belonging to a language not possessing an alphabet) and (ii) are identical except for differences in spelling arising from the adoption of different methods for transcribing the barbarous word concerned into the Latin alphabet.
- (2) The rules specified in (1) above apply also within any given genus to any pair of names consisting of the trivial names of species or of subspecies of species referred to that genus.

CASE No. 55

ARTICLE 35 : PROPOSED INSERTION OF A PROVISION THAT FOR THE PURPOSES OF ESTABLISHING A CONDITION OF SECONDARY HOMONYMY BETWEEN TWO SPECIFIC NAMES IT IS NOT NECESSARY THAT AN AUTHOR SHOULD EXPRESSLY CITE THE NAMES IN HOMONYMOUS COMBINATIONS BEFORE REJECTING AND REPLACING THE LATER PUBLISHED OF THE TWO TRIVIAL NAMES INVOLVED

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)586)

DOCUMENT 55/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.**

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

REPORT ON THE ADOPTION OF A " DECLARATION " CLARIFYING THE CONDITIONS NECESSARY TO ESTABLISH A CONDITION OF SECONDARY HOMONYMY BETWEEN ANY TWO SPECIFIC NAMES

The question whether for the purposes of establishing a condition of secondary homonymy between any two specific names it is necessary that an author should expressly cite the names in homonymous combinations before rejecting and replacing the later published of the two trivial names involved was first raised by Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty in the course of his application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the question of the correct trivial name for the Kidney Worm of Swine (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2 : 286, 288-289). Dr. Dougherty took the view that express action of the foregoing kind was not a necessary condition for establishing a condition of secondary homonymy and added that, in order finally to dispose of this question, it was, in his view, desirable that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should make a pronouncement upon it. Accordingly, in agreement with Dr. Dougherty, a request for a *Declaration* on this subject was made by the Secretary to the International Commission (Hemming, 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 120-122).

2. Terms of the " Declaration " voted upon by the International Commission : The following is the text of the proposed *Declaration* on which

the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature voted by post in 1952 :

For the purposes of the provision relating to the rejection of secondary homonyms, an author rejecting one name as a secondary homonym of another name is required to make it clear that he considers that the species bearing the trivial name so rejected is congeneric with another species bearing a previously published identical trivial name but is free to indicate his view on this subject in whatever way he may consider appropriate, provided that the method so adopted leaves no reasonable doubt that he considers the two species concerned to be congeneric with one another.

3. Adoption on 22nd August, 1952, of a " Declaration " clarifying the procedure to be adopted in establishing the existence of a condition of secondary homonymy between two specific names : The International Commission adopted on 22nd August, 1952, a *Declaration* on the foregoing subject in the terms of the draft set out in paragraph 2 above. Of the 18 members of the International Commission there voted in favour of the proposed *Declaration* the following 16 Commissioners (arranged in the order in which votes were received) : W. T. Calman ; E. M. Hering ; J. R. Dymond ; B. Hankó ; P. Bonnet ; H. E. Vokes ; J. C. Bradley ; A. do Amaral ; F. Hemming ; T. Esaki ; N. D. Riley ; H. Lemche ; J. Pearson ; N. R. Stoll ; H. Boschma ; A. Cabrera. No Commissioner voted against the proposed *Declaration*. No votes were received from two Commissioners (T. Jaczewski ; R. Mertens).

4. Submission of " Declaration " by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology : Under the procedure governing the rendering by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of *Declarations* interpreting the *Règles*, an interpretation so given becomes operative immediately, but it is the duty of the International Commission to submit a *Declaration* so adopted to the next International Congress of Zoology for final approval. In accordance with the foregoing procedure, the *Declaration* set out in paragraph 2 of the present note adopted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by 16 votes (two Commissioners not voting) is hereby submitted to the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology for final approval.

CASE No. 56

TRANSCRIPTION OF THE LATIN "V" (VOWEL) AND "V"
(CONSONANTAL) AND OF THE LATIN "I" (VOWEL) AND "I"
(CONSONANTAL)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)393)

DOCUMENT 56/1

By **PIERRE BONNET** (*Université de Toulouse, France*)

Editorial Note : The following application was submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in 1948, but at the Paris Session was deferred for later consideration (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 209-212). The present application was published in 1950 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 3 : 199), but, as it is quite short, it is here reprinted for convenience of reference. (Int'l'd.) F.H. 20th May, 1953.

Proposition 17

Ajouter à l'Appendice, un paragraphe "F" intitulé :

Transcription du "v" et du "i" latins

Les lettres "v" et "i" deviennent "u" et "i" devant une consonne, et v ou j devant une voyelle. Exemples :

1^{er} cas : *urbs, ventus, illustris, imperialis.*

2^e cas : *dives, ventus, jugum, jacundis.*

En appliquant cette règle au préfixe "Eu," elle donne en effet *Eusparassus, Eugnatha, Euphoresia*, etc, et doit donner *Evagrus, Evetria, Evathlus, Evangelium*, etc. (et non *Euagrus, Euetria, Euathlus, Euangelium*).

Explication : Les Romains n'avaient qu'une lettre pour l "v" voyelle et pour le "v" consonne ; une seule lettre aussi pour le "i" voyelle et le "i" consonne ; mais la pratique a voulu par la suite que le "v" voyelle

devienne un "u" et le "i" consonne un "j"; il y a lieu de se conformer à cette pratique et de l'appliquer intégralement en interdisant les écritures *iuguam*, *iucundis*, *Iupiter* et en obligeant les auteurs à écrire le préfixe "eu" sous cette forme devant une consonne : *Eusparassus*, *Eugnata* et l'écrire "ev" devant une voyelle : *Evagrus*, *Evetria*, termes qui sont plus euphoniques que *Euagrus* ou *Euetria*, bien que cette dernière écriture soit étymologiquement plus correcte.

DOCUMENT 56/2

By the late **LODOVICO DI CAPORACCO** (*University of Parma, Italy*)

Statement received on 19th January, 1948

**PROPOSAL 17 BY PROFESSOR BONNET CONCERNING THE LATIN
LETTERS "V" AND "I"**

I fully agree with this proposal. The Latin letters "v" and "i" should always be written as "u" or "i" before a consonant; the Latin letter "i" should always be written as "j" before a vowel.

DOCUMENT 56/3

By Dr. JIRI PACLT (*Bratislava, Czechoslovakia*)COMMENT ON PROFESSOR PIERRE BONNET'S PROPOSITION 17
CONCERNING THE ORTHOGRAPHY OF SCIENTIFIC NAMES

Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) proposed quite recently¹ that the following paragraph should be added to the Appendice to the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature.

Paragraph "F" entitled "Transcription of the Roman 'v' and 'i'".—"The letters 'v' and 'i' before a consonant, and 'v' and/or 'j' before a vowel. Examples: *urbs*, *ventus*, *illustris*, *imperialis* (in the former event); *dives*, *ventus*, *jugum*, *jucundis* (in the latter case)."²

First, there must be referred to some inexactness in the above proposal. Should the letters "v" and "i" become respectively "v" and "j" before a vowel [sic], then the words *imperialis* (quoted as an example, *ut supra*), *Equus*, *conspicuus*, *tenuis*, etc. are to be written *imperjalis*, *Equus*, *conspicvus*, *tenuis*, etc. This is surely not intended by the author of that proposal. Accordingly, the dicta "before a consonant (i) and "before a vowel" (ii) are to be completed as follows: "before a consonant and, in addition, before a vowel at the ending of a syllable" (i); "before a vowel at the beginning of a syllable" (ii).

Unfortunately, these amendments of the original dicta of Professor Bonnet cause serious trouble if we consider the transcription of Greek diphthongs like *αι*, *ει*, *οι*, *υι*, *αν*, *εν*, followed by a vowel. How names such as *Aglaiia*, *Αγλαΐα*, *Meioneurites*, *Μειονεοριτης*, *Oiorhinus*, *Οιορρινος*, *Euonymus*, *Εὐωνυμος*, *Evetria*, *Ευετρία*, are to be spelt in that case? The philologically correct spellings of these names would be: *Aglaea*, *Meoneurites* (better than *Mioneurites*), *Oerhinus*, *Euonymus* and *Eueteria*.

According to Article 70 of the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature and Article 19 of the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature, the original spelling of a name must be retained, except in the case of a typographic error, or of a clearly unintentional orthographic error (error of transcription, a *lapsus calami*). When this rule is applied to the above mentioned examples, we find it necessary to use the original forms *Aglaiia*, *Meioneurites*, *Oiorhinus*, *Euonymus*, *Evetria*. It may be proposed, however,

¹ *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 3: 199, 1950 and Document 56/1.

² The original text in French put here into English.

to authors of new names that, owing to the requirement of euphony, the following suggestions should be regarded in the future :

- (i) the diphthong $\epsilon\iota$ be transliterated before a vowel as *e*, and before a consonant as *i* ;
- (ii) the diphthongs $\alpha\iota$ and $\omicron\iota$ be still transliterated as *ao* and *oe* respectively ;
- (iii) the diphthongs $\alpha\nu$ and $\omicron\nu$ be still transliterated as *au* and *u* respectively ;
- (iv) the diphthong $\epsilon\nu$ be transliterated before a vowel as *ev*, and before a consonant as *eu*, e.g., $\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$, *eveuretus*.

The question of writing the simple letters *v* (*u*) and *i* (*j*) being rather of typographic than orthographic nature, we may use the rules of transcription prospectively and retrospectively, provided that a proposal for the amended version of the respective paragraphs will be accepted. Such minor additions to the Code would bring the official biological nomenclature in greater compliance with the practice.

On the other hand, some rules of the transliteration of Greek diphthongs cannot have any power to change the original orthography of names, and may only be considered as being a prospective and non-retroactive recommendation.

Jiri Paclt, ScD.,
Forest Products Research Laboratory,
Bratislava, Czechoslovakia.

CASE No. 57

NEW ARTICLE RELATING TO THE STATUS OF NAMES PUBLISHED AS THE NAMES OF INFRA-SUBSPECIFIC FORMS : PROPOSAL TO EXTEND THE PERIOD OF GRACE BEFORE THE NEW RULES APPLY IN THEIR ENTIRETY TO NAMES PUBLISHED FOR TAXONOMIC UNITS BELOW THE SPECIES LEVEL BUT NOT CLEARLY INTENDED TO APPLY TO POPULATIONS AS CONTRASTED WITH INDIVIDUAL FORMS AND OTHER MINORITY ELEMENTS

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)718)

DOCUMENT 57/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

ON THE RELATION TO THE EXISTING PROVISIONS REGARDING THE STATUS OF NAMES GIVEN TO INFRA-SUBSPECIFIC FORMS OF THE PROPOSAL SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY UNDER COVER OF A LETTER DATED 19th JUNE, 1952, FROM PROFESSOR CHARLES D. MICHENER, THEN CHAIRMAN OF THE NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE ABOVE SOCIETY

Annexed hereto as Document 57/2 is a paper prepared on behalf of the Society of Systematic Zoology on the subject of the status of names published for infra-subspecific forms and the relationship of such names to names published as the names of species and subspecies. This document was forwarded to the International Commission under cover of a letter dated 19th June, 1952, signed by Professor Charles D. Michener, Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee of the above Society; both these documents were actually communicated to the International Commission by Mr. W. I. Follett who had succeeded Professor Michener as Chairman of the above Committee before the despatch of the letter prepared by Professor Michener.

2. The document referred to above states clearly the object which it is desired to attain but it does not make it clear to what extent and in what respects the proposal submitted would call for the amendment of the existing

rules on this subject. Accordingly, in order to facilitate the further consideration of this proposal, the present note has been prepared to show the nature of the changes sought.

3. The proposal submitted in Document 57/2 is twofold in character or rather one main proposal is submitted, and a second more limited proposal is put forward for consideration if the main proposal fails to secure support. The proposals are :—

- (1) "A name of less than specific rank published before 1st January, 1954, shall be considered for nomenclatorial purposes a subspecies if at the time of the original publication the author did not definitely indicate that he considered it an infra-subspecific form by calling it an aberration, transition, form, phase or seasonal form. Perhaps more such names could be safely added to this list."
- (2) "In any event, varietal names published before 1st January, 1954, should be available for specific or subspecific names. An important point is that "variety" was widely used by many taxonomists as a synonym of "subspecies".

4. It will be seen that the proposals submitted relate (a) to the definition to be adopted for the group of names which, by reason of being names published as names for infra-subspecific forms should be regarded as ineligible for consideration, as from the date of such publication, as names for species and subspecies, and (b) to the date to be adopted as that as from which the definition under (a) above should become operative. It will be convenient at this point to take note of what are the existing rules in regard to the above matters.

5. **Existing definition of a "name of an infra-subspecific form" :** The existing rules start by prescribing the terms to be applied to denote the two groups of names to be recognised below the species level, namely "subspecific name" and "infra-subspecific name" (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 89, Conclusion 1(2)). Each of these expressions is then defined for nomenclatorial purposes as follows (1950, *ibid.* 4 : 89–90, Conclusion 1(3)) :—

As used in connection with the foregoing categories of name, the expression "subspecies" and "infra-subspecific form" shall have the meanings specified below :—

<i>Expression</i>	<i>Definition of expression.</i>
"subspecies"	A population (<i>e.g.</i> , geographical, ecological) within a species which differs from any other such population within the same species.
"infra-subspecific form"	Any form of a species other than a subspecies as defined above (<i>e.g.</i> , seasonal forms and minority elements of all kinds within a species such as sexual forms, transition forms, aberrations, etc.

6. Difficulties which the form adopted for the definition of "subspecies" and "infra-subspecific form" was designed to overcome: It will be seen at once that the definitions adopted were designed to denote the concepts represented by the expressions "subspecies" and "infra-subspecific form" and not to provide a catalogue of the expressions which, when used by authors in publishing a new name, should be held to indicate in the one case whether the name in question was being published as a "subspecific name" or, on the other hand, as an "infra-subspecific name". This method of providing definitions was adopted deliberately for two reasons: (a) It would be quite impossible either in the case of "subspecies" or in that of "infra-subspecific form" to provide a complete catalogue of the terms which, when used by an author on publishing a new name, were to be held to denote the foregoing concepts, owing partly to the great variety of such terms in any given language and partly to the fact that in countries using different languages different words were used to denote these concepts. Moreover, to use Dr. J. Brookes Knight's now celebrated phrase, it would in the case of a subspecies be highly "ritualistic" and therefore undesirable to make it an essential requirement that some specified word (e.g., "subspecies," "race," etc.) to be used in order to clothe with availability the name given to what from the description was quite clearly intended to be a name for a population. (b) Some words had become so time-worn that it was impossible to ascertain from the word itself, without reference to the accompanying description (and not always then), whether the word used was intended to denote a population ("subspecies") or only some minority element ("infra-subspecific form"). The outstanding example of a word which no longer possessed a definite content was the word "variety" and its Latin version "varietas." Difficulties of this sort would not arise, however, if the definition adopted in the *Règles* was directed to the meaning of the author of a new name and not to the word or expression which he used to denote that name. It was for these reasons that the definitions quoted in paragraph 5 above were adopted in preference to definitions attempting to catalogue, and to assign meanings to, expressions used by authors when publishing names for taxonomic units belonging to categories below the species level.

7. Interlocked character of the definitions adopted for nomenclatorial purposes for the expressions "subspecies" and "infra-subspecific form": It will be noted from the quotation given in paragraph 5 above that the definitions adopted for the expressions "subspecies" and "infra-subspecific form" are directly linked to one another, the simplest kind of definition being given to the expression "subspecies," the expression "infra-subspecific form" being defined as containing any form within a species other than a "subspecies," as defined. The whole basis of the scheme for providing a status for names of "infra-subspecific forms" independent of that accorded to the names of "subspecies" (and species) hinges, therefore, upon the adoption of a definition of the expression "subspecies" for nomenclatorial purposes. It is because the whole object of the scheme was to provide a basis for names given to infra-subspecific forms which would not inconvenience in any way the large number of zoologists who feel no need for recognising the category "infra-subspecific

form," as contrasted with the category "subspecies" ("population") that it is necessary to provide in the *Règles* definitions for these two categories for nomenclatorial purposes, since, unlike other categories dealt with in the *Règles*, names belonging to these two categories are subject to independent rules and are not co-ordinate with one another as are the names of genera and subgenera and the names of species and subspecies. The solution actually adopted made it necessary to provide in the *Règles* a substantive definition, as we have already seen, for one only of the two categories to be defined. Thus the necessity for inserting definitions—which is deplored by Dr. K. H. L. Key in Document 57/3—was reduced to the minimum compatible with the introduction of the desired scheme. In order to minimise the risk of misunderstandings, particular care was taken both (i) to underline the fact that the definition was given solely for nomenclatorial purposes (in order to distinguish "subspecific names" and "infra-subspecific names" from one another) and (ii) to ensure that the definition so adopted for the expression "subspecies" should be as simple as possible. It was for this reason that the definition adopted was confined to the single concept of a "population."

8. Means provided for determining whether a given name was published as a "subspecific name" or as an "infra-subspecific name": The second part of the scheme for according—subject to certain conditions—a status under the *Règles* to names for infra-subspecific forms was to provide means for identifying such names and thus for separating them from names given to subspecies. The solution here adopted was to prescribe a more rigorous standard for names published after a certain date subsequent to the adoption of the scheme and a more lenient one for names published before that date. For names published after the prescribed date it was required that the author should make it clear, if the name was to rank as having been published for a subspecies, that he intended it to apply to a population, while, in the case of names published before that date, all names were to rank as having been published for populations (i.e., for subspecies), except where the author made it clear that this was not so.

9. The prescribed date for the coming into force of the scheme for giving a limited status to infra-subspecific names: The provisions relating to the names of infra-subspecific names came into operation as from midnight 31st December, 1950/1st January, 1951.

10. The proposals submitted on behalf of the Society of Systematic Zoology: Having now taken note of the relevant portions of the present rules relating to the naming of infra-subspecific forms, we may turn back to examine the extent to which the proposals submitted on behalf of the Society of Systematic Zoology (paragraph 3 above) involve proposed changes in the existing rules. These changes are now seen to be the following:—

- (1) **Date of commencement of the scheme:** It is proposed by the Society that the date fixed for the coming into operation of the scheme

should be postponed by three years, *i.e.*, from 1st January, 1951 to 1st January, 1954.

- (2) **Means to be adopted for identifying a name as a name given to an infra-subspecific form :** It is proposed that in respect of names published after the date recommended in (1) above, a name should rank as having been given to a subspecies—or at least that it should be available for use as such as from its original date of publication—in all cases except where the author expressly indicated that he was applying the name to some minority element as defined in (3) below and not to a whole population. In other words, the proposal is to apply to all names, irrespective of date of publication, the more lenient of the two existing tests, *i.e.*, the test at present applicable only to names published before the prescribed date (1st January, 1951).
- (3) **Definition of “infra-subspecific form” :** It is suggested that a name should be held to have been published as a name for an infra-subspecific name by reference to the words used by the author to denote the taxonomic unit concerned at the time when he named it and that an attempt should be made to list the words to be accepted as indicating that a name was published as an “infra-subspecific name.”
- (4) **A proposal alternative to proposals (2) and (3) above :** It is suggested, as a possible alternative to proposals (2) and (3) above, that there should be inserted a provision prescribing that, wherever the expression “var.” (*varietas*) is applied to a taxonomic unit, on a name being given to that unit, the name so given should rank as having been given to a subspecies and not to an infra-subspecific form. The application does not make it clear whether it is suggested that this provision should apply to names published on or after 1st January, 1954, or only to names published before that date.

DOCUMENT 57/2

Report furnished by Professor CHARLES D. MICHENER, when
Chairman of the **COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE SOCIETY OF
SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY**

Letter, dated 19th June, 1952, from Professor **CHARLES D. MICHENER**, communicated under cover of a letter dated 27th July, 1952, by Mr. **W. I. FOLLETT**, Professor Michener's successor as chairman of the above Committee.

The Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology has recently made a study of a number of nomenclatorial problems. In some

instances it has sent a ballot to members of the Society in order that its opinion and recommendations to you would correctly reflect the viewpoint of American taxonomists.

The material on the enclosed sheets* deals with the results of such ballots. It is transmitted to you with the request that the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature be notified of the stand of the Society on the problems concerned, and that, where Rules or *Opinions* are involved, this stand be considered in connection with the proposed revisions of the *Règles*.

Enclosure to Professor Michener's letter of 19th June, 1952

Infra-specific Names

The rules concerning infra-specific names adopted at the Paris (1948) meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, see *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* vol. 4, pp. 81-96, contain a proposal which has been adversely criticised by many members of the Society of Systematic Zoology, and is particularly important for entomologists and other invertebrate zoologists.

It is provided that a name of less than specific rank published before 1st January, 1951, shall be considered for nomenclatorial purposes a subspecies if at the time of original publication the author indicated he considered it as such or if he failed to indicate its status. It shall be considered as infra-specific name only if the author so indicated.

Very many forms have been described through the years as varieties and the like and later raised to subspecific or specific status. They do not qualify as subspecific or specific names, since the authors neither stated that they considered them subspecies nor failed to indicate their status. The task of searching the literature to find when each such name was first stated to be a subspecies or a species, crediting it to a new author and a new date, and then determining whether it is, with its new date, a synonym or homonym, would be immense, and the result would be many thousands of name changes.

To get a clear idea of the view of members of the Society of Systematic Zoology, the following brief synonymies (A and B), with the ballot questions indicated, were sent to the membership of the Society of Systematic Zoology.

**Ed. Note:* The other sheets enclosed by Professor Michener are published elsewhere in the present volume, (initialled) F.H. 20th May, 1953.

(A) *Alpha beta* var. *gamma* Smith, 1890.

Alpha gamma Jones, 1920 (based on Smith's var. *gamma*).

As of 1945

After Paris decisions

(1) I would use *gamma* Smith, 1890, for this species.

(2) I would use *gamma* Smith, 1920, for this species.

(B) *Alpha nigra* aberration *alba* Smith, 1920.

Alpha alba Jones, 1930 (based on Smith's
aberr. *alba*).

(1) I would use *alba* Smith, 1920, for this species.

(2) I would use *alba* Jones, 1930, for this species.

The results show that a large majority of taxonomists, not only before 1948 but also after, would regard names proposed as varieties and even aberrations (before some date such as 1st January, 1951) as co-ordinate with specific names, not with infra-subspecific names.

I therefore recommend that the following provision be incorporated into the *Règles*: A name of less than specific rank published before 1st January, 1954 shall be considered for nomenclatorial purposes a subspecies if at the time of original publication the author did not definitely indicate that he considered it an infra-subspecific form by calling it an aberration, transition, form, phase, or seasonal form. Perhaps more such names could be safely added to this list. In any event varietal names published before 1st January, 1954, should be available for specific or subspecific names. An important point is that "variety" was widely used by many taxonomists as a synonym of "subspecies".

Charles D. Michener,
Chairman, Nomenclature Committee,
Society of Systematic Zoology.

DOCUMENT 57/3

By K. H. L. KEY (*Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation,
Canberra, Australia*)

Extract from a letter dated 17th October, 1952

While I appreciate the reasons that prompted the Commission and the Paris Congress to decide to incorporate in the Code a definition of the concept "subspecies," I feel that serious dangers are associated with such a course of action. The Code contains no definition of the far more important concepts "species" and "genus," and I imagine that it would be impossible to reach any agreement on definitions of the kind that would enable a zoologist to determine what he should regard as a species and what as a genus. In effect, the Code regards as a species any entity held to be a species by any author—and so with "genus". It says, "If you have a species, then such and such rules apply"; but it offers you no guidance as to whether you have a species or not. In other words, the Code confines itself to nomenclatorial issues and avoids taxonomic issues. I am afraid that whatever definition of subspecies may be used in the Code, there will be a storm of protest, probably with outright refusals to accept the definition. I therefore consider that if it is humanly possible to frame rules governing subspecific nomenclature without attempting to set up an "official" definition, then that should be done. If it is not possible, then I am uncertain as to the wisdom of setting up such rules at all. I am sorry that this comment is almost wholly destructive, but it is the only comment I can make in the time at my disposal.

CASE No. 58

INFRA-SUBSPECIFIC NAMES : PROPOSAL TO WITHDRAW RECOGNITION

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)742)

DOCUMENT 58/1

NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC
ZOOLOGY

Statement received under cover of a letter dated 27th July, 1952, from
Mr. W. I. FOLLETT, Chairman of the above Committee

I enclose reports (in duplicate) on the remaining five nomenclatorial problems that were submitted to ballot of the entire membership of the Society of Systematic Zoology during Dr. Charles D. Michener's chairmanship of the nomenclature committee of that Society.

These reports* are entitled as follows :

- (2) "Infra-subspecific Nomenclatural Categories."

This material is transmitted to you for publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, with the request that the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature be notified of the stand of the Society on the problems concerned, and that, where Rules or *Opinions* are involved, this stand be considered in connection with the proposed revisions of the *Règles*.

Annexe to Document 58/1

INFRA-SUBSPECIFIC NOMENCLATORIAL CATEGORIES

During Dr. Charles D. Michener's chairmanship of the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology, the following ballot was distributed to the members of that society :

- (1) I recommend that no category of less than subspecific rank be accorded nomenclatural recognition.

*The other documents here referred to are being published at the appropriate parts in the present volume.

- (2) I recommend that infra-subspecific categories be accorded nomenclatural recognition in one way or another.

According to Dr. Michener's tabulation of the votes cast, the result was as follows :

- (1) 211 (infra-subspecific nomenclatural categories not to be recognised).
- (2) 86 (infra-subspecific nomenclatural categories to be recognised).

In view of these returns, it is strongly recommended that the action of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the Paris (1948) meeting, in recognising quadrinominals, be reversed, and that no nomenclatural category of less than subspecific rank be recognised by the *Règles*.

Dated 27th July, 1952.

W. I. Follett,
Chairman, Nomenclature Committee,
Society of Systematic Zoology.

DOCUMENT 58/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.*(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)*

Attention is invited to two considerations which arise on the preceding request (Document 58/1) for the revocation of the decision taken in 1948 to provide a nomenclatorial basis for the names of infra-subspecific forms for use by those zoologists who find it necessary or desirable for their work that infra-subspecific forms should be recognised and desire that means should be provided for regulating names given to such forms :—

- (1) Many zoologists—of whom I am one—see no need for the purposes of their own work to give names to infra-subspecific forms. The lack of a definition in the *Règles* of what constitutes a subspecies for nomenclatorial purposes and the fact that many workers treated the undefined use of the word “subspecies” in Articles 11 and 12 as rendering available for promotion to the rank of subspecific (and, therefore, of specific) rank names expressly published for minority elements (seasonal forms, sexual forms, etc.) had led by 1948 to a state of confusion which called urgently for attention. Moreover, as long as there was any doubt as to the availability of such names for promotion to be the names of subspecies and species, an immense and quite unnecessary labour was imposed upon all zoologists who found no need to recognise infra-subspecific forms, for it was necessary for them carefully to list all such names and to take account of them for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy. Many zoologists felt that the best course would be to refuse all recognition in the *Règles* to such names, but—as is illustrated by Document 57/2 also submitted by the Society of Systematic Zoology—such a course would have involved serious problems, in view of the difficulty—in many cases—of determining whether a given name was published as a subspecific name or as an infra-subspecific name, and the considerable number of such names currently applied to subspecies in various groups. Quite apart from these considerations, there was also the fact that a substantial body of workers—particularly in certain groups—attached great importance to the naming of infra-subspecific forms, and demanded the grant of recognition to such names.

The solution adopted in 1948 was designed to overcome the difficulties hitherto caused to zoologists who did not desire the recognition of infra-subspecific forms or of the names given to them, while at the same time meeting the demands of those workers who

attached importance to infra-subspecific forms and to giving them names. This object was achieved by giving to infra-subspecific names a status under the *Règles* but one independent of that given to subspecific names, means being provided, however, for the transfer, where necessary, of a name from one of these categories to the other. The advantage of this arrangement was that it relieved zoologists who objected to such names of any need for taking them into account, while at the same time it provided a basis for such names for those workers who used them and attached importance to them. This solution was, in effect, a "live-and-let-live" solution, each point of view being substantially met, neither side imposing upon the other a solution distasteful to it.

Now that this question has been raised again, it is to be hoped that it will be approached in the same spirit and that workers holding each of the opposing points of view will pay regard not only to the objectives to which they themselves attach importance but also to those to which importance is attached by those who hold the opposite point of view.

- (2) It must be noted that the present is the second of two papers on the subject of infra-subspecific nomenclature which have been submitted by the Society of Systematic Zoology, the other being that to which Document 57/2 has been allotted. The two documents were submitted separately and no explanation was furnished as to their relationship to one another. My understanding of these documents is that Document 58/1 is intended to secure the discarding of infra-subspecific names as a separate category of name recognised in the *Règles*, while Document 57/2 is intended to confer a status in zoological nomenclature upon infra-subspecific names, if published in a manner so ambiguous that they might be regarded as being intended to apply to subspecies, so that names published in this way may be available for use as subspecific names. This is a matter which will need to be cleared up when these papers come to be discussed.

CASE No. 59**NOMENCLATURE OF THE SPECIFIC COMPLEX**

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)685)

DOCUMENT 59/1

By **S. G. KIRIAKOFF, L.Sc.**

(*Zoological Museum, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium*)

THE NOMENCLATURE OF THE SPECIFIC COMPLEX

So far as I am aware, there have not been up to now propositions submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature regarding the nomenclature of the specific complex. Although a great improvement has been achieved by the elimination of the so-called "infra-subspecific" names, there still remain so far only two taxonomic categories belonging to the specific complex and officially recognised by the *Règles*. These two categories are the species and the subspecies.

On the other hand, not only has the necessity of using a few additional taxonomic categories belonging to the complex just referred to, been long felt, but numerous workers have actually used and are using such categories in a number of recent publications. The categories so used are the following: the ultraspecies (superspecies of Mayr) and the semispecies (I have called these two "circumspecific" categories); further, the cline; and finally, distinction has been made by some writers, on the suggestion of J. S. Huxley, between subspecific units of various origin, *i.e.*, between geographic, ecological and cytological subspecies or races.

I suggest therefore the above question to be submitted to the forthcoming Zoological Congress, or directly to the Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, in order to provide with a legal status at least those of the taxonomic categories listed above which have already been used in recent works.

The arrangement I propose is the following :

(a) Intraspecific categories :

(1) Geographical race : the name of such a race follows the specific name and is preceded by a capital G ;

(2) Ecological race : as above, but preceded by a capital E ;

(3) Cytological race : as above, but preceded by a capital C ;

(4) Cline : composed of the names of the two peripheric (initial and terminal) races which the cline includes, this combination being preceded by the abbreviation Cl (as proposed by Huxley) ; each of the peripheric races is named as under (1) or (2) above.

(b) Circumspecific categories :

(1) Species proper : named binomially ;

(2) Semi-species : the name of the first described form included in a semi-specific complex precedes that of each of the remaining forms involved and is placed in parentheses. If the semi-specific name is that of the first described form involved, this last is of course repeated and parentheses used as above ;

(3) Ultra-species (not synonymous with superspecies of Mayr : *cf.* Kiriakoff, *Bull. Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg.* 84, 1948 : 64 ; —, *The Lepidopterists' News*, 2, 1948 : 1) : named binomially ; the name used is that of the first described form, preceded by a capital U. The name of each form included in an ultra-species is written following the name of the first described form in the complex. The prior form is placed in ordinary parentheses if the included form is a race or a semi-species, and in square parentheses if it is a good species.

CASE No. 60

**PROPOSED SUBSTITUTION OF THE TERM " SPECIFIC NAME " IN PLACE
OF THE TERM " TRIVIAL NAME " FOR THE SECOND PORTION OF A
BINOMINAL COMBINATION**

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)697)

DOCUMENT 60/1

Statement furnished by the **NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE
AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK**

Enclosure to a letter dated 18th July, 1952, from Dr. **ERNST MAYR**

The term " specific name " has been universally used, since about 1800, for the *specific epithet* of the scientific name (binomial). This usage was codified in the Strickland Code (1842) and has been included in every Code of Zoological Nomenclature since that period. It is the wording of the International Code of 1901. This wording is logical and unambiguous, because within the binomial scientific name it is the specific name which *specifies*. The word *specific* is the clear counterpart to the word *generic* for the generic component which designates the group name component within the scientific name.

The suggestion was made in Paris to shift the word *specific* from its time-honoured usage to a new role as the term for the whole scientific binomial. The Commission is herewith petitioned to annul this confusing transfer and to confirm the term " specific name " for the specific epithet of the binomial.

It is furthermore proposed to introduce the term " binomial " or " binominal " to designate the whole binomial scientific name.

The revival of the Linnaean term *trivial*, which was abandoned by early post-Linnaean authors, is to be deplored. Its application to subspecific and variety names causes considerable conceptual difficulties. Furthermore, the

term trivial is confusing for linguistic reasons. To the average person in Anglo-Saxon countries the term "trivial name" means a "trifling, negligible name" while in most other European languages "trivial name" means "vernacular name".

Signed :

The Nomenclature Committee at the American
Museum of Natural History, New York.

ERNST MAYR

JOHN T. ZIMMER

G. H. H. TATE

C. H. CURRAN

CASE No. 61**PROPOSED ADOPTION OF THE ADJECTIVE "NOMINATE" IN PLACE
OF THE ADJECTIVE "NOMINOTYPICAL" TO DENOTE THE SUBSPECIES
OF A POLYTYPIC SPECIES UPON WHICH THE ORIGINAL DESCRIPTION
OF THAT SPECIES WAS BASED**

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)690)

DOCUMENT 61/1**By the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE
AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK**

Enclosure to a letter, dated 1st July, 1952, from Dr. **ERNST MAYR**

We propose that the word "nominotypical" throughout the text of the Rules be replaced by the more appropriate word "nominate".

As explained by Simpson, Rensch, Mayr and other authorities on the principles of taxonomy, a nominate subspecies is no more "typical" than any other subspecies of a species, nor is a nominate subgenus more typical than any other subgenus, or a nominate subfamily than any other subfamily. The only attribute that distinguishes nominate sub-categories is that they include the "onomatophores," the name bearers of the category. The term "nominate" is not only in more universal usage than "nomin-typical," it is also shorter and it avoids the potential confusion of a typological interpretation of the respective categories.

Signed :

The Nomenclature Committee at the American
Museum of Natural History, New York.

ERNST MAYR

G. H. H. TATE

JOHN T. ZIMMER

C. H. CURRAN

CASE No. 62

**NEED FOR UNIFORMITY OF RULES OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE;
FOR THE WHOLE OF THE ANIMAL KINGDOM**

(Commission's reference Z.N.(G.)61)

DOCUMENT 62/1

By the **NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE
SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY**

Letter, dated 27th July, 1952, from Mr. W. I. FOLLETT,
Chairman of the above Committee

I enclose reports (in duplicate) on the remaining five nomenclatorial problems that were submitted to ballot of the entire membership of the Society of Systematic Zoology during Dr. Charles D. Michener's chairmanship of the nomenclature committee of that society.

These reports* are entitled as follows :

(1) " Extent of Uniformity of Rules."

.

This material is transmitted to you for publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, with the request that the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature be notified of the stand of the Society on the problems concerned, and that, where Rules or *Opinions* are involved, this stand be considered in connection with the proposed revisions of the *Règles*.

*The other documents here referred to are being published at the appropriate parts in the present volume.

Annexe to Document 62/1**EXTENT OF UNIFORMITY OF RULES**

During Dr. Charles D. Michener's chairmanship of the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology, the following ballot was distributed to the members of that Society :

- (1) I prefer uniform rules of nomenclature for the whole of zoology.
- (2) I prefer separate (although presumably similar) rules for such major fields as entomology, ornithology, etc., except that a generic name in one field which is a junior homonym of a generic name in another field would be invalid.
- (3) I prefer separate rules for each major field, without contact even on the point of generic homonymy.

According to Dr. Michener's tabulation of the votes cast, the result was as follows :

- (1) 280 (uniform rules for whole of zoology).
- (2) 26 (separate rules, except on homonymy, for major fields).
- (3) 6 (entirely separate rules for each major field).

In view of these returns, it is urgently requested that uniform rules of nomenclature be maintained for the whole of zoology.

Dated 27th July, 1952.

W. I. Follett,
Chairman, Nomenclature Committee
Society of Systematic Zoology.

CASE No. 63

TREND AWAY FROM "AUTOMATIC NOMENCLATURE"

(Commission's reference Z.N.(G.)62)

DOCUMENT 63/1

**By the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE
SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY**

Letter, dated 27th July, 1952, from Mr. W. I. FOLLETT,
Chairman of the above Committee

I enclose reports (in duplicate) on the remaining five nomenclatorial problems that were submitted to ballot of the entire membership of the Society of Systematic Zoology during Dr. Charles D. Michener's chairmanship of the Nomenclature Committee of that Society.

These reports* are entitled as follows :

.

(5) "Trend away from "Automatic Nomenclature"."

This material is transmitted to you for publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, with the request that the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature be notified of the stand of the Society on the problems concerned, and that, where Rules or *Opinions* are involved, this stand be considered in connection with the proposed revisions of the *Règles*.

Annexe to Document 63/1

TREND AWAY FROM "AUTOMATIC NOMENCLATURE"

During Dr. Charles D. Michener's Chairmanship of the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology, the following ballot was distributed to the members of that Society :

- (1) I approve of the trend away from "automatic nomenclature," involving increased use of the plenary powers of the Commission, the

*The other documents here referred to are being published at the appropriate parts in the present volume.

establishment of long lists of nomina conservanda, and points in the rules where the worker is instructed to consult the Commission.

(2) I deplore the trend away from "automatic nomenclature."

According to Dr. Michener's tabulation of the votes cast, the result was as follows :

(1) 147 (approve trend away from "automatic nomenclature").

(2) 151 (deplore trend away from "automatic nomenclature").

As the plurality of four votes out of a total of 298 does not appear mathematically significant, this report is tendered for the purpose of recording the division of opinion within the Society.

Dated 27th July, 1952

W. I. Follett,
Chairman, Nomenclature Committee,
Society of Systematic Zoology

CONTENTS

Copenhagen Discussions : Cases 53-63

	Page
Case No. 53 : Articles 34 and 35 : proposal that differences in spelling arising solely from differences in the manner in which the word forming the name has been transliterated into the Latin alphabet from some other alphabet should be ignored for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy	427
Case No. 54 : Articles 34 and 35 : proposal that differences in the spelling of names based upon barbarous words arising solely from the adoption of different methods for transcribing into the Latin alphabet the barbarous word concerned should be disregarded for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy	430
Case No. 55 : Article 35 : proposed insertion of a provision that for the purposes of establishing a condition of secondary homonymy between two specific names it is not necessary that an author should expressly cite the names in homonymous combinations before rejecting and replacing the later published of the two trivial names involved ..	432
Case No. 56 : Transcription of the Latin "v" (vowel) and "v" (consonantal) and of the Latin "i" (vowel) and "i" (consonantal) ..	434
Case No. 57 : New Article relating to the status of names published as the names of infra-subspecific forms : proposal to extend the period of grace before the new rules apply in their entirety to names published for taxonomic units below the species level but not clearly intended to apply to populations as contrasted with individual forms and other minority elements	438
Case No. 58 : Infra-subspecific names : proposal to withdraw recognition	446
Case No. 59 : Nomenclature of the specific complex	450
Case No. 60 : Proposed substitution of the term "specific name" in place of the term "trivial name" for the second portion of a binominal combination	452
Case No. 61 : Proposed adoption of the adjective "n nominate" in place of the adjective "nominotypical" to denote the subspecies of a polytypic species upon which the original description of that species was based	454
Case No. 62 : Need for uniformity of rules of zoological nomenclature for the whole of the Animal Kingdom	455
Case No. 63 : Trend away from "automatic nomenclature"	457